

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

kn

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

Г	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
_	10/627,531	07/25/2003	John Harvey	030299	2906		
	23696	7590 10/02/2006		EXAMINER			
	QUALCOMM INCORPORATED			LIEU, JULIE BICHNGOC			
	5775 MOREH SAN DIEGO.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	<i>57111 21200</i> , 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		2612			
					DATE MAIL ED: 10/02/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/627,531	HARVEY, JOHN			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Julie Lieu	2612			
The MAILING DATE of this comm Period for Reply	unication appears on the cove	r sheet with the correspondence a	ddress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisi after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this co.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for re Any reply received by the Office later than three mont earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	MAILING DATE OF THIS CO ons of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, how mmunication.  In tatutory period will apply and will expire ply will, by statute, cause the application to a first the mailing date of this communication.	OMMUNICATION.  ever, may a reply be timely filed  SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this of the become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
<ul><li>2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b>.</li><li>3) ☐ Since this application is in condition</li></ul>	,—				
Disposition of Claims		·			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-24 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2, and 4-24 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/0-Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	(PTO-948) 3) 5) 🗌	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. Notice of Informal Patent Application Other:			

Art Unit: 2612

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed July 17, 2006. Claim 1 has been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled.

- 2. The indicated allowability of claim 3-24 is withdrawn. Rejections follow.
- 3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-19, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lauber et al. (US 2004/0090950 A1).

### Claim 1:

Lauber et al. (Lauber) discloses method for providing a virtual fences for use with a delivery vehicle, comprising:

- a. determining that an activation event is a sub-event (vehicle at the loading dock);
- b. activating a first virtual fence (vehicle route geofence); and
- c. concurrently activating a second virtual fence (geofence for loading dock area);
- d. wherein activation of at least one of the virtual fence is based the sub-event. See para. [0393].

Art Unit: 2612

## Claim 2:

The first and second virtual fence in Lauber is selected from a group comprising a boundary fence, a perimeter fence, and a route fence.

### Claim 4:

The sub-event in Lauber is one of a vehicle sub-event, a trailer sub-event, and a driver sub-event. See para. [0393].

#### Claim 5:

The method disclosed by Lauber comprises a step of activating one of a boundary fence, a perimeter fence, and a route fence based on the sub-event.

#### Claim 7:

The method in Lauber further comprises steps of determining that the protection event is a deactivation event; and deactivating a virtual fence based on the activation event.

### Claim 8:

Lauber discloses a protection system that operates to provide a virtual fence for use with a delivery vehicle, the protection system comprising:

- a. input logic that is coupled to receive a protection signal;
- b. fence logic that is coupled to the input logic, being operable to activate a first selected virtual fence from a plurality of virtual fences in response to said protection signal being indicative of one of a plurality of activation events involving vehicle motion and not having vehicle engine dependence, the fence logic being further operable to concurrently activate a route fence along a route of said delivery vehicle, from said plurality of virtual fences, in connection with a determination of a delivery vehicle route.

Art Unit: 2612

See paras. [0322], [0323], and [0393].

Claims 9 and 10:

The input logic in Lauber is operator input logic and the protection signal can be either an operator input signal or a sensor input. Paras. [0407-0410] and [0421].

Claim 12:

In the Lauber system the input logic is position input logic and the protection signal is a position signal.

Claim 13:

The input logic disclosed in Lauber is communication input logic and the protection signal is a communication signal.

Claim 14:

In Lauber's, the protection signal is any combination of an operator signal, a sensor signal, a position signal, and a communication signal.

Claim 15:

The Lauber system further comprises position logic that operates to determine a vehicle position, wherein the position logic outputs the vehicle position in a position signal that is the protection signal. See para. [0393].

<u>Claim 17:</u>

Lauber discloses an apparatus for providing a virtual fence for use with a delivery vehicle, the apparatus comprising:

a. means for detecting a protection event (vehicle in motion result in GPS location changes);

Art Unit: 2612

b. means for determining that the protection event is one of a plurality of activation events involving vehicle motion and not having vehicle engine dependence;

- c. means for activating a selected virtual fence, from a plurality of virtual fences, based on the activation event; and
- d. means for concurrently activating a route fence along a route of said delivery vehicle, from said plurality of virtual fences, in connection with a determination of said route of the delivery vehicle.

See paras. [0322], [0323], and [0393].

## Claim 18:

The Lauber system includes means for determining that the activation event is a subevent (vehicle at loading dock) and means for activating the selected virtual fence based the subevent.

### <u>Claim 19:</u>

Lauber disclose means for activating one of a boundary fence, a perimeter fence, and a route fence based on the sub-event.

### Claim 22:

The Lauber system further comprises means for deactivating a virtual fence based on the activation event.

### Claim 24:

Lauber discloses a computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions for providing a virtual fence for use with a delivery vehicle, the instructions when executed perform a method, comprising steps of:

Art Unit: 2612

a. detecting a protection event;

b. determining that the protection event is an activation event;

c. activating a selected virtual fence from a plurality of virtual fences based on one of a plurality of activation events involving vehicle motion and not having vehicle engine dependence, and

d. activating a route fence along a route of said delivery vehicle, from said plurality of virtual fences, in connection with a determination of a delivery vehicle route.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 6, 11, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauber et al. (US 2004/0090950 A1) in view of Moses (US 2003/0169853).

### Claims 6, 11, and 20:

The reference fails to clearly state whether the delivery vehicle is one with combination of a tractor and trailer. Nevertheless, tractor/trailer trucks are conventionally used as delivery vehicle. Further, the concept of tracking tractor/trailer-type delivery vehicle when a vehicle sensor senses disconnection between the tractor and trailer is old in the art as taught in Moses. See para. [0022]. In light of Moses, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add this detection feature in the system of Lauber and use it to inform a possible theft condition and/or to initiate a geofencing activation event because it is a possible theft condition and vehicle tracking should be initiated.

### Claim 21:

Application/Control Number: 10/627,531

Art Unit: 2612

Moses also teaches monitoring each critical asset 50. Thus, one skilled in the art would have incorporate this concept into the Lauber system because it would be desirable to track each

asset, especially if they are critical as taught in Moses. See para. [0022].

6. Claims 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauber

et al. (US 2004/0090950 A1) in view of Andre et al. (US 2003/0151507).

Claims 16 and 23:

The Lauber system further fails to disclose a message processing logic that is coupled to

the fence logic, wherein the message processing logic outputs a vehicle message that is used to

control a vehicle control system. However, the concept of controlling the vehicle when a theft

condition exists or potentially happens is well known in the art as taught in Andre et al. See

para. [0005]. In light of this teaching, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized the

desirability of controlling the vehicle when theft condition is detected as taught in Andre et al.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Julie Lieu whose telephone number is 571-272-2978. The

examiner can normally be reached on MaxiFlex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 7

Art Unit: 2612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Julie Lieu

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2612

Sept 25, 06